

lot—that when the report comes in the whole problem can be discussed and thrashed out. I for one, and I think I speak for the whole committee, say that we never intended to do anything to affront the House or to adopt back-door methods.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: The honourable senator is absolutely right: I made no objection this morning. But why was that? It was because I assumed that the report would come to the Senate, and because I did not know then that the gentleman to whom we were giving \$50 a month was already getting \$4,400 a year, although the honourable leader gets only \$4,000. That is my only excuse for raising this question now. I say, never mind what we are going to do later when we go into the rules, but let us decide if this is right.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: Honourable senators, I may say with respect to the payment of \$600 a year to the leader's secretary, that it is in accordance with what has been done for several years, and I know that my predecessor's secretary was paid the same amount. The honourable leader of the House could bring in a secretary of his own, and if he did, the \$600 would have to be paid. But he prefers, very wisely, I think, to have an experienced official like Mr. Hinds, who will not only act as his secretary, but will also assist him in a great many other ways in regard to legislation, the debates, and so on. The point that I wish to make very clear is that the committee is only doing what has been done before, over a long period of years.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Will the honourable gentleman say whether or not his predecessor did this same thing? Did his predecessor's lady secretary get a cheque for \$50 a month, endorse it and turn it over to the man we are now talking about? Is that right? I am told that it is.

Hon. Mr. BALLANTYNE: I cannot answer that. I know that Mr. Meighen's secretary received payment.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: And endorsed the cheques over to the man we are now discussing, I am told. I should like to be put right if I am wrong.

Hon. Mr. KING: I have no knowledge of that.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: What puzzles me most in connection with this very interesting discussion is the reason why the Auditor General should require a resolution from the committee.

Hon. Mr. DUFF: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. HAIG.

Hon. Mr. HAIG: We do not know.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: If that is the requirement, it puzzles me to know why the resolution did not reach us. What is there in connection with this appointment that requires a resolution? The requirement comes from the Auditor General himself. Where does the authority come from that enables our Committee on Internal Economy and Contingent Accounts to pass a resolution without reference to this House? It all seems very strange to me.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: That is what I want to know.

Hon. Mr. KING: I suggest that we let the matter stand and make further inquiries to see if it cannot be disposed of in a way that satisfies the House. I am not familiar with the matter.

Hon. Mr. MURDOCK: Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. KING: The committee can meet again and reconsider it.

The Hon. the SPEAKER: The question stands.

P.E.I. CAR FERRY AND TUNNEL INQUIRY

Hon. Mr. MacARTHUR inquired of the Government:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to attempt the raising and rehabilitation of the car ferry sunk last summer?

2. Is there another boat being procured for additional service between Prince Edward Island and the mainland?

3. Has the Government up-to-date data re cost of tunnel between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick?

Hon. Mr. KING: The answers to the inquiry of the honourable gentleman are as follows:

1. Salvage of the vessel is not regarded as practicable. This view is based on the report of the underwriters' surveyor, who is also representative of the Salvage Association of London, which reads as follows:

The undersigned conferred with officials of the Canadian National Railways, also Maritime Towing & Salvage Ltd., Halifax, and Messrs. Merritt, Chapman & Scott Corporation, New York, on the possibilities of salvage of the "Charlottetown". The salvage companies, after careful consideration of the vessel's location, and with the plans of the vessel at their disposal, consider the salvaging of the "Charlottetown" not practicable. It is therefore recommended that no expense be incurred by attempting examination or salvage of the vessel.

In consequence of the above report, confirmed by a separate opinion by Foundation Maritime Limited, the Department of Trans-